



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Synopsis of Important Articles.

The Chronology of Israel and Assyria in the Reign of Shalmaneser II.*
 —In Shalmaneser's Monolith Inscription occurs the name *A-ha-ab-bu Sir'-lai*. On the Black Obelisk occurs the name *Ja-u-a abal Hu-um-ri-i*. Do these names designate respectively "Ahab of Israel," and "Jehu son of Omri?" As for the first, against this view is (1) the use of the name *Sir'-lai* here only to designate Israel; (2) the orthographical difference between the Assyrian names and the Hebrew; (3) the improbability of Ahab sending 2,000 chariots as the inscription says that *A-ha-ab-bu* did; (4) the difficulty of chronology; (5) the fact that the other kings mentioned in the B. O. passage were all Hittites. As for the second name, it is stated that the tribute was received from *Ja-u-a* in the 18th year of Shalmaneser. This will not synchronize with any year of Jehu. It is therefore suggested that *Ja-u* had become a general title for Israelitish kings and was considered as a sufficient designation by the Assyrians for the king reigning at any particular time, when accompanied by the name of the country, capital or dynasty. At least the chronology makes it certain that both these names could not be identified with these two Jewish kings. One or the other, if not both, are thus wrongly identified. The conclusions are (a) *A-ha-ab-bu Sir'-lai* was not Ahab, of Israel; (b) *Ja-u-a abal Hu-um-ri-i* was not Jehu, son of Omri, but the contemporary king over the land of Israel, who, by the date, we identify with Jehoahaz. This identification explains 2 Ki. 13: 5, 6. The "saviour" was Shalmaneser. We thus obtain a perfect agreement of the Assyrian and Hebrew chronology for the period of the first twenty-one years of the reign of Shalmaneser. *Sir'-lai* is regarded as "prince of Sir," a city which is identified as being near the scene of the battle of Karkhar.

An argument of no little ingenuity. It is gratifying to observe such evidences that American ministers and students are taking interest in Assyriological literature as related to the Bible.

Judas Iscariot.†—The choice of Judas as an apostle was natural to Jesus (1) from a theological point of view, considering his work or his person; (2) in view of the need that he experience by the treachery of Judas the worst kind of suffering; (3) in view of the ways of God, who permits others to perish in spite of high privileges. The career of Judas was also natural. Jesus' phrase "Did I not choose you the Twelve, and one of you is a devil?" presents the problem and hints at the explanation: Judas is not now what he was then; the choice was prior to the degradation. Following the course of the Scripture statements, we are struck by the taciturnity of Judas. Almost from the first he must have had a baffled sense of unfitness for his calling, mingled with eager desire to secure the great things which Jesus promised. He thus lay warily silent awaiting developments. But Jesus' disregard of popular applause and neglect of chances, would vex and chafe him, while he still lingered on hoping for the kingdom. The opera-

* By Rev. Joseph Horner, D.D., in *The Methodist Review*, Sept.-Oct., 1889, pp. 711-724.

† By the Very Rev. G. A. Chadwick, D.D., in *The Expositor*, Sept., 1889, pp. 161-174.

tion with varying intensity of these two forces, personal alienation from Christ and selfish adhesion to his party, explains the conduct of Judas. Jesus would not remove him but he would hold the door open for him to depart. "Do ye also choose to go away?" It was natural that Judas should stay. It was also natural that he should be full of the fury of disappointment. As higher impulses died in him, he grasped at petty dishonest gains. Hence the loss of the price of the ointment exasperated him. Now the devil makes his home in him. Note his iron nerve at the Supper. He would stand by hoping for news which he could carry to the priests. Jesus dismisses him. When the betrayal was over, it was natural that the difference between the contemplation of guilt and the actual burden of it should alarm his soul too late. No further intuition led him to seek pardon from the all-merciful one. So he goes to his own place, the only mortal whose dark fate we surely know.

A presentation closely following the facts and statements of the Scripture on this dark problem. The positions are not always clearly indicated but the drift of the article is similar to that of Prof. Ballantine in the August *STUDENT*, with which the view may be compared.

The Age and Authorship of Ecclesiastes.*—The testimony of the book itself to its age and author is not to be rejected without demonstrative proof of its worthlessness. What are the arguments urged against it? (1) the passage 1 : 16. But the reference is to the line of kings and princes from the days of Melchisedek ; (2) in 1 : 12 a king of the past is represented as speaking. But the better meaning is "When I became king" etc.; (3) the state of affairs social and political described in the book. But all this did exist in Solomon's reign, and wise and powerful ruler as he was, he was unable to solve the social problem ; (4) certain historical allusions to later times, e. g., 4 : 13, 14 ; 10 : 16, 17. These are far-fetched ; (5) the presence of passages which attack Essene principles, e. g., 9 : 2, 9 ; 10 : 15 ; 4 : 9-12 ; and those of other sects. These can be fairly explained otherwise ; (6) the use of Koheleth instead of Solomon. The meaning of Koheleth is "she who collects," referring to the soul of the author. Solomon's name is withheld because as king, the one who by his name was to make peace, he confesses that he could not fulfill his mission ; (7) the book contains Greek philosophy, the search for the "summum bonum." But the same appears in Ps. 39. Neither the method employed nor the results arrived at betray any non-Jewish element ; (8) the style and diction of the book. This is explained somewhat by the peculiar subject and its peculiar treatment, demanding a special vocabulary. The words can all be satisfactorily explained. "Koheleth" does not contain, therefore, any facts or circumstances that necessarily point to a period later than Solomon. It is possible that the ideas and arguments taught by him were handed down and written at a later time. Certain positive arguments for the Solomonic authorship are (1) Koheleth is King over Israel in Jerusalem. Solomon was the last one who satisfies this statement ; (2) the wisdom claimed by Koheleth fits Solomon ; (3) the extravagant expenditures could have been made only by Solomon ; (4) the long course of experience befits Solomon's long reign ; (5) the disappointments which made success seem a vanity were in line with Solomon's experiences ; (6) the experience of rebellion and usurpation (8 : 9) befits Solomon's youth ; (7) the likeness of Ecclesiastes in many sentiments to other writings attributed to Solomon.

A vigorous re-statement of the traditional view of the authorship of Ecclesiastes. The review of objections to this view is much stronger than the positive proofs presented. The article will repay study.

* By Dr. M. Friedländer, in *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, July, 1889, pp. 359-375.